

## **Meeting Notes**

### **10 Sept 2008**

**Location:** Chelan PUD Auditorium, 327 N. Wenatchee Ave.

**For more info contact:** Casey Baldwin 509-664-3148 [baldwcmb@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:baldwcmb@dfw.wa.gov)

---

**RTT members present:** Casey Baldwin, Joe Lange, Joe Kelly, Michelle McClure, Dennis Carlson, Chuck Peven, Kate Terrell, Tracy Hillman, Tom Kahler, Cam Thomas.

**Others present:** James White, Pamela Nelle, Steve Kolk

**Agenda:** No new topics were added to the agenda, although the order of several items was shifted. Additionally, the group decided to discuss “RTT active participation in project development” in executive session.

**2008 SRFB Projects Update:** Casey presented the individual Citizens Advisory Committees (CAC) rankings tables that were provided by Derek VanMarter. After some discussion about the project lists, Casey described the effort that would occur during the combined CAC meeting in Chelan on Sept. 11th. Kate asked if the combined citizen’s committee meeting takes an ESU perspective into account, ensuring that the best projects move forward regardless of equity between the Lead Entities. Casey mentioned that in the past they have used a 1-1, 2-2 approach that did strive for equity between the Lead Entities. Chuck mentioned that he read the CAC criteria and was surprised to see that their economic criteria do not appear to evaluate whether or not the budget of a proposal is appropriate. There was concern over the sensitivity of this issue and the timing of this discussion. Since the RTT does not look at total cost in our criteria there may be a need for the regional process to incorporate an assessment of project budgets at some level (**but not in the RTT rating criteria**). The group discussed a couple of possibilities 1) perhaps the SRFB could provide “typical” or “average” costs of projects previously completed or 2) the NWFCs has economic analysts that might be able to help the region with this task. Michelle mentioned that Mark Plummer has a graduate student working on a project that might be helpful. She will look into it if products are available will provide them on a FYI basis. The RTT will not take further action on this topic but will leave it to Derek and the CAC’s to determine what they want or need from others or us.

**Implementation Team Update:** Casey described the agenda items covered at the Implementation Team meeting on Sept. 9<sup>th</sup>.

**RIST review questions for Recovery Plan appendices P & Q:** Casey handed out the list of questions provided by Julie Morgan and the group took some time to briefly review them. James expressed concern that the questions were set up so that if the region was not monitoring everything everywhere then their conclusions would be that our monitoring was not adequate. He and Julie were concerned because of the financial and logistical impossibility of monitoring everything everywhere. Michelle said that she thought the RIST was well aware that everything could not be monitored everywhere and did not think that was the intent of the questions. Michelle encouraged the group to provide alternative wording where appropriate. Chuck thought that the questions should be segregated and prioritized by monitoring categories: 1) compliance and implementation 2) status and trend 3) effectiveness monitoring. Numbers one and two would require a greater level of scrutiny and thoroughness since they are critical to evaluating VSP parameters and threats, which are the central components to making delisting decisions. Number

three would not need to be as comprehensive because results would be more broadly transferable and it would be used primarily to feed into an adaptive management approach to implementing recovery projects. ISEMP is an example of NOAA and BPA's approach to targeting only certain areas for effectiveness monitoring.

Casey agreed to circulate an electronic copy of the list to the full RTT and give people a week or so to provide more input.

**Post implementation project tours:** Casey handed out a master list of projects funded through the SRFB since 1999 for the Chelan and Okanogan Lead Entities. The RTT selected a list of projects they would like to see on October 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>. Tracy provided additional projects that the HCP Tributary Committees would like to see. Casey will coordinate with the Citizens Advisory Committees on September 11<sup>th</sup> to determine if there are any additional projects that the CAC wants to see. Casey will work out the logistics of the tour with Becky G. of the Tributary Committees and the Lead Entity Coordinators. Casey mentioned that we will not be able to visit certain projects on the list this year due to logistical constraints such as landowner willingness, travel time, etc.

Chelan LE projects:

Beebe Springs (2005) *(logistically, we would have to see this one on the way to the Okanogan / Methow)*

Entiat Instream Habitat improvements (2005)

Entiat River Offchannel Rearing habitat (2000)

Harrison sidechannel *(we might want to wait 1-2 yrs, see how the schedule pans out)*

Dryden Fish Enhancement (2004)

Nason Creek offchannel (2005)

Alder Creek culverts (2006)

Gagnon offchannel *(?dependent on landowners?)*

Okanogan LE projects:

Sloan-Wichert Slough Habitat/Irrigation (2001)

Early Winters Creek Dike Removal (2001)

Hancock Springs (2006)

Fulton Dam Removal (2004)

MVID East (2005)

Heath floodplain restoration (trib only 2006)

Goodman livestock excl. (trib only; 2007) *RTT does not necessarily want to see it because the fencing went in late this year, however, if it fits into the tour and its important to the Trib Com. then no problem).*

Omak Creek Restoration (1999)

**ISEMP update:** Pamela Nelle provided an update on the ISEMP project, which just completed its 5<sup>th</sup> year and is preparing for the first round of data analysis. ISEMP is planning a data analysis workshop on November 13<sup>th</sup> to tie in with the Nov. 12<sup>th</sup> RTT meeting. Casey mentioned that the Nov 12<sup>th</sup> RTT meeting would be focused on preparing for the 2009 RTT analysis workshop and that ISEMP would likely be a large contributor to that workshop.

Pamela said that ISEMP is now a “BiOp project” and that it is not part of the Fish and Wildlife Program and that it would be up to full funding in 2009.

Pamela mentioned that ISEMP is working on an Implementation Strategy for the Entiat that they would appreciate the RTT's review and input on it. Perhaps first through the MaDMC and then, if people felt it was necessary, the full RTT.

**Barrier Prioritization Framework:** Casey said the workgroup was unable to complete the document in time for the meeting. They will continue to work on it and get it to the RTT as soon as possible.

### **RTT active participation in project development:**

Casey explained that he has fielded several requests for RTT participation with various groups that are developing projects in the Upper Columbia Region. Casey described a potential alternative paradigm whereby one or more RTT members would be active on design teams/core teams/ID teams/ etc. within each of the subbasins. This alternative would likely require a substantial time commitment increase by RTT members and it would change the dynamics of the project rating process that the RTT currently uses. At a minimum, multiple RTT members would have to abstain from scoring on almost every project and our review would be much less independent and might be biased against projects that are developed outside of the processes that RTT members are involved in. Additionally, this approach might create an expectation that the presence of an RTT member on a project development team would entitle a project to receive a good score during project review. The strength of the RTT review process is that multiple technical reviewers combine their knowledge and expertise, a benefit that would not occur while we were to split up onto the various project development teams.

The group discussed this alternative and determined that the RTT can better serve the Region by remaining as independent and objective as possible. We currently have a system that allows for project sponsors to get early review by the RTT and there is several feedback loops during the pre-proposal and site visit process. The group agreed to re-visit the *Biological Strategy* over the coming months and see if we can make it more prescriptive in an attempt to provide more guidance to project sponsors.

The group also confirmed that individual RTT members could be on a project development team if they are there as part of their normal duties and representing their agency or organization. However, they would need to be clear that they are not representing the RTT and that they would not be scoring any projects that came out of the project development process in which they were involved.

12:30 adjourn